

REMARKS

The Office Action of July 29, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully considered. An RCE is being filed concurrently to permit further prosecution.

The present Amendment cancels dependent claim 9. It also adds a new set of claims 10-15 to further protect the invention. Claim 10 is the same as claim 1, except for two modifications. One of these modifications is that claim 10 recites “33 to 40 % by weight of an inorganic powder ...” (instead of “33 to 50 % by weight,” as in claim 1). The other modification is that claim 10 recites “not more than 30 % by weight of a reinforcing fiber” (instead of “20 to 30 % by weight,” as in claim 1). It is respectfully submitted that modifications appearing in claim 10 are supported by examples 1 and 2 in the application’s Table 2. New dependent claims 11-14 are the same as claims 2, 4, 5, and 6, respectively, except they depend from new independent claim 10. New dependent claim 15 recites the same range of reinforcing fiber as claim 1.

The Office Action again rejects the claims for obviousness based on Asai in view of Isutsumi and “Handbook of Fillers.” The Office Action comments that example 2 becomes non-inventive when claim 9 is considered, and that the scope of what is claimed is broader in the actual showing an example 1.

As was noted above, the present Amendment cancels claim 9. This has been done in order to make it clear that example 2 is also an example supporting claim 1.

Among other limitations, claim 1 recites that (1) a resin pulley has an inorganic powder in the amount of 33 to 50 % by weight, (2) it has reinforcing fiber in the amount of 20 to 30 % by weight, and (3) the weight of the inorganic powder is greater than the weight of the reinforcing fiber. Items (1) and (2) are modified in new independent claim 10.

It was common in prior art resin pulleys for the amount of reinforcing fiber to be larger than the amount of inorganic powder, since it was felt that embedding a large amount of fiber in the resin was needed for strength. For example, the amount of fiber is greater than the amount of inorganic powder in the examples and also the compared of examples of the Asai reference. In contrast to the prior art, the inventors reduced the amount of reinforcing fiber (which attacks belts) and compensated for this reduction by increasing the amount of inorganic powder. The result is a pulley with a reduced tendency to attack the belt, and with the pulley itself having good wear resistance as an added bonus. An Amendment that was filed on July 27, 2007 included a "Figure A" which clearly shows that wear resistance is significantly improved with the present invention.

Asai does not disclose or suggests the invention defined by the independent claims, and the remaining two references do not supply what is missing from Asai. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood
Registration No. 28,134
Customer number 23995
Rabin& Berdo, P.C.
(202) 326-0222 (telephone)
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng